

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Attorney Docket No.: 10444.500-US

AUG 15 2005

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Lund et al.

Confirmation No: 2299

Serial No.: 10/817,292

Group Art Unit: 1632

Filed: April 2, 2004

Examiner: Kosson, R.

For: Enzymatic Treatment of Paper Making

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

Sir:

I hereby certify that the attached correspondence comprising:

1. Response to Restriction Requirement

was sent to the United States Patent Office by telefax to the attention of Examiner Kosson, R., fax number (703)872-9306

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 15, 2005

Julie Tabarovskiy
Julie Tabarovskiy
Novozymes North America, Inc.
500 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1600
New York, NY 10110
(212) 840-0097

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 15 2005

Attorney Docket No.: 10444.500-US

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Lund et al. Confirmation No: 2299
Serial No.: 10/817,292 Group Art Unit: 1632
Filed: April 2, 2004 Examiner: Kosson, R.
For: Enzymatic Treatment of Paper Making

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This paper is filed in response to the Office Action mailed July 13, 2005 that made restriction and election of species requirements. Applicants were requested to elect one of ten designated groups.

In response to these requirements, Applicants hereby elect with traverse the invention of group II, directed to a method of treating paper making pulp, comprising alkaline treatment followed by pectate lyase treatment, classified in class 435, subclass 96. Applicants were also required to elect a species in claim 8, either i) hydrogen peroxide or hydrosulphite bleaching or ii) repulping of recycled pulp. Applicants elect species i) of claim 8 directed to hydrogen peroxide or hydrosulphite bleaching. As indicated in the Office Action, claim 8 is generic. Applicants hereby reserve the right to file continuing applications directed to the nonelected subject matter.

The basis for traverse is that there would not be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction were not required. Groups I, II, III, VI, VII, VIII, and IX are all classified in Class 435, subclass 96. Clearly, as they are classified in the same class and subclass, the examiner would be searching the same art and it would not be an undue burden on the examiner to search at least these groups together.

Moreover, Applicants submit that claim 1 links all of the inventions and the examiner is requiring the applicants to redraft the generic claim. Therefore, upon allowance of the linking claim, the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions should be withdrawn and all claims within the linked inventions should be examined in the instant application.

The Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if there are any questions concerning this response or application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 15, 2005



Jason I. Garbell, Reg. No. 44,116
Novozymes North America, Inc.
500 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1600
New York, NY 10110
(212) 840-0097